## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN NORTHERN DIVISION

MITHAQ AL HUMRANI,	
Plaintiff,	
v.	Case No. 2:05-cv-166 HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL
CATHY BAUMAN,	TIOT WODEN THOU SHEET

Defendant.

MITHAO AL HILMDANI

## OPINION AND ORDER APPROVING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation filed by the United States Magistrate Judge in this action on July 11, 2006. The Report and Recommendation was duly served on the parties. The Court has received a responsive brief from plaintiff that the court will consider objections. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has performed *de novo* consideration of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objection has been made. The Court now finds the objections to be without merit. Plaintiff has failed to show that his right to access the courts was violated or that defendant violated his constitutional rights.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is approved and adopted as the opinion of the court.

The court must next decide whether an appeal of this action would be in good faith within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). *See McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 611 (6th Cir. 1997). For the same reasons that the court grants defendants' motion for summary

judgment, the court discerns no good-faith basis for an appeal. Should the plaintiff appeal this

decision, the court will assess the \$455 appellate filing fee pursuant to § 1915(b)(1), see McGore,

114 F.3d at 610-11, unless plaintiff is barred from proceeding in forma pauperis, e.g., by the

"three-strikes" rule of § 1915(g). If he is barred, he will be required to pay the \$455 appellate filing

fee in one lump sum.

Date: August 22, 2006 /s/ Robert Holmes Bell

ROBERT HOLMES BELL

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE